

United States District Court
Central District of California

FARSTONE TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

APPLE INC.,

Counterclaimant,

v.

FARSTONE TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Counterdefendant.

Case No. 8:13-cv-01537-ODW (JEMx)


**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE:
FINAL JUDGMENT FOR CLAIMS 8
AND 14 [193]**

After GRANTING the Proposed Stipulated Judgment and Dismissal of Claims 1–7 and 9–13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,120,835 (the “835 Patent”) as invalid for indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 (ECF No. 193), the **Court asks parties to clarify as to Claims 8 and 14**, which were also found to be invalid for indefiniteness in this Court’s Supplemental Claim Construction Order (ECF No. 192).

1 Parties have until October 29, 2015 to inform the Court as to what actions, if
2 any, will be taken concerning these two outstanding claims.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 October 19, 2015

7
8 

9
10 **OTIS D. WRIGHT, II**
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28